DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 351 298 SP 034 105

AUTHOR Carter, K. Kenneth; And Others
TITLE A System for Improving Performance of First-Year Teachers.
PUB DATE Feb 92
NOTE 82p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (San Antonio, TX, February 25-28, 1992).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Beginning Teacher Induction; *Beginning Teachers; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Preservice Teacher Education; Probationary Period; State Standards; *Teacher Certification; *Teacher Evaluation; *Teacher Improvement; Teacher Qualifications
IDENTIFIERS *Kentucky; *Performance Based Certification

ABSTRACT

In 1984, the Kentucky General Assembly mandated a beginning teacher internship program that combined knowledge testing prior to a 1-year initial license for teaching and performance assessment prior to continuing licensure (determined by an internship committee with a teacher at the same school, a principal, and a teacher educator). An internship classroom observation instrument (COI) was developed to record interns' contextual, behavioral, and class study characteristics. Observation committee members record and code interns' teaching behaviors at three intervals and then send nine COIs and a final report to the Kentucky Department of Education as documentation for issuing a teaching license. To document the progress of interns during two study years, COI data were analyzed for 1989-1990. Results focus on changes occurring from the first to the third observations, examining communications, responses, questioning techniques, praise, management, and time. Continuous assessment of interns along with periodic feedback provides committee members with a chance to induct new colleagues into teaching. Over half of the interning teachers favored extended clinical experience before and after the first year of teaching. (SM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED351298

A SYSTEM FOR IMPROVING PERFORMANCE OF FIRST-YEAR TEACHERS

K. Kenneth Carter
Northern Kentucky University
Highland Heights, Kentucky

Donald K. Cobb
Northern Kentucky University
Highland Heights, Kentucky

Dale L. Lawver
Northern Kentucky University
Highland Heights, Kentucky

Elizabeth Nelli
University of Kentucky
Lexington, Kentucky

Paper Presented at the
American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
San Antonio, Texas

February, 1992

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN **OTHER THAN PAPER COPY** HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

K. Kenneth Carter

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

SB 34/05

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

KENTUCKY TEACHER INTERNSHIP PROGRAM

Introduction

Historical Setting

During the 1970s, public pressure in Kentucky increasingly focused on testing for teachers prior to certification. Between 1980-1983, the Kentucky Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (KACTE) authored a number of position papers advocating performance assessment along with knowledge evaluation and forwarded them to legislators.

In January 1984 the Kentucky General Assembly mandated a beginning teacher internship program that combined knowledge testing prior to a one-year initial license for teaching, and performance assessment prior to continuing licensure.

As created by the legislature, the internship program's testing component assesses general knowledge, communication skills, professional knowledge and subject-matter knowledge. After passing the tests, completing the college preparation program and obtaining a teaching position, candidates are issued a license for the internship year, defined as the first year of teaching after completing training and testing prerequisites.

The General Assembly specified for each intern a beginning teacher internship committee composed of three people: the school principal where the intern is employed, an experienced resource teacher (preferably in the same school, grade level and subject area), and a teacher educator. All must successfully complete the training specified by the State Board, observe the intern independently at least three times during the year, and participate in four committee meetings.

By law, the resource teacher is paid for 50 hours of out-of-school assistance. Training for all committee members in classroom observing and assessing is the responsibility of the eight state universities, with internship monies funnelled through the Department of Education. The resource teacher is chosen by random selection after the requirements of same school, same grade levels/subject matter are met. Legislators emphasized that they would tolerate neither district nor Department politicking in the selection process.

In a watershed decision that has received little attention, the General Assembly determined that the decision about continuing licensure would be made by the three-member internship committee. By majority vote, the committee specifies continuing certification, a repeat of the internship year, or no certificate. The Department of Education must honor the committee's decision.

The Advisory Committee on the Teacher Internship Program (ACTIP) met for the first time May 21-June 1, 1984 and immediately addressed the mandated testing. In December, 1984 it selected the NTE Core Battery and specialty tests and set the cut off scores.

Concurrently, it studied all available internship and performance evaluation literature, and in March, 1985, recommended the Florida Performance Measurement System (FPMS). The FPMS professionals, particularly Dr. Donovan Peterson, were generous with their expertise and time.

Western Kentucky University provided facilities for the first FPMS training, which occurred May 27-31, 1985. The 25 Kentucky trainees were college faculty and staff, teachers and district administrators. This cadre became Commonwealth Trainers, and supervised by FPMS experts, trained a second level of trainers during June and July. This second level trained classroom observers in each region of the state.

In August, 1985, the first 650 interns and 1950 internship committee members initiated the internship program. The number of interns has increased each year until the cost of running the program has out-paced the annual $2.4 million allocated by the legislature.

As the program's success became clear, legislators demanded that the FPMS be replaced by Kentucky-designed components. Accordingly, concurrent with program implementation during 1987, a consortium of trainers formed to restudy internship contents and procedures.

The consortium scrutinized the internship knowledge base and updated it to include current research literature, discarded all studies that lacked a clear connection between teacher performance and student achievement. It redesigned the coding manual and created a new classroom observation instrument which the Kentucky

Department of Education field-tested. A committee reviewed RFPs for new training and testing videotapes. The entire training agenda was reworked to focus on assistance to the intern.

The Classroom Observation Instrument (COI)

The internship classroom observation instrument (COI) has evolved to record three major components as these are observed: contextual characteristics, behavioral characteristics, and class study characteristics. Contextual characteristics are comprised of the intern's personal attributes and the class level and type of lesson being observed. Categorizing an intern's behavioral characteristics refers to such traits as cueing the learner, re-directing student questions, and clarifying the topic. The frequency with which the intern achieves these targeted teaching traits is viewed as use of effective teaching practices. The structural component of the observation instrument assesses interactions between the intern and students during classroom group and/or independent study times.

Teaching behaviors used in the KTIP classroom observation instrument (refer to Appendix A) were selected from research findings on effective teaching. These research results led to the establishment of specific principles found to explain "best practices" used in effective teaching. Each behavior thus identified and included on the observation instrument is a derivative of the 11 principles selected to define characteristics of effective classroom teaching. All behaviors selected are generic across grade levels and subject content. An example of

one of the 11 principles guiding the targeted teaching behaviors is "Teachers who clearly state each concept, law or rule; who define or state the component, explain it in a language from which the students can profit; who demonstrate either by example or analogy; and who provide guided and independent practice increase the likelihood of student achievement." Similar research-based teaching principles were selected to identify specific teaching behaviors to be monitored using the COI.

Using the Classroom Observation Instrument

In using COI, each member of the three-person observation team is required to record the teaching behaviors of the intern over 60-minute time segments. These observation samples are taken during three-month time intervals of a given school term. The first teaching sample is recorded by mid-November, a second sample between mid-November and mid-February, and a final observation is completed by early May. Additional observations of the intern may be scheduled by mutual agreement.

Each KTIP team of a teacher in the same school, school principal and college/university faculty member, codes behaviors during each observation in the form of frequencies. That is, each time a particular behavior is observed during the lesson, a tally mark is made on the COI next to that behavior. At the end of the lesson the number of tally marks for each behavior is summed. The behaviors summed after the observation are in the form of "observed" or "not observed" -- therefore, a check mark (v) is placed beside a specified behavior if it is observed; a zero (0)

is placed beside it if it is not observed. Behaviors may also be coded "NA" -- not applicable. All recorded observations of the intern's teaching style are summarized and discussed with the intern following each classroom visit. During these regularly scheduled professional development opportunities with the intern, time is devoted to discussion of effective and ineffective teaching behaviors and to assisting the intern organize specific career goals.

A Professional Development Plan (PDP) is begun early in the internship program and is updated periodically as additional observations are made. It is assumed that interns will improve during the course of the year as a result of the information received in the conference sessions, the assistance provided by the three-member team during the year, and the PDP that is developed and maintained.

At the end of the year all nine Classroom Observation Instruments and a final report on the intern are forwarded to the Kentucky Department of Education to serve as documentation for the issuance of a teaching license.

Method in Conducting the Study

To provide documentation regarding the progress of the interns during each of the two years under consideration, data from the Classroom Observation Instruments for 1989-90 were keypunched. The Kentucky Department of Education began the keypunching of the data; however, because of the large amount of editing as well as keypunching and because of other priorities,

Northern Kentucky University was asked to complete the editing, keypunching, and analysis of the data. Data that had been keypunched in Frankfort were then transferred to the DEC VAX 4000 Computer at Northern Kentucky University. In addition, the data keypunched at Northern Kentucky University were merged with the Kentucky Department of Education data file. A new scanning system was installed by the Kentucky Department of Education for the second year (1990-1991); therefore, those data were transferred from the mainframe computer at the Kentucky Department of Education to the mainframe computer at Northern Kentucky University.

The Classroom Observation Instrument does not provide a place to indicate the observation number. In order to determine the first, second, and third observation, the computer was programmed to sort the COI by the following dates:

First Observation - Any observations prior to November 16

Second Observation - Any observations from November 16 to February 15

Third Observation - Any observation after February 15.

These dates coincide with the timelines established by the Kentucky Department of Education as stated in the manual KENTUCKY TEACHER INTERNSHIP PROGRAM: CONCEPTS AND INDICATORS OF EFFECTIVE TEACHING. Analysis was made of only the first and the third observations in order to show change over time during the internship year.

Results of the Study

Frequency counts served as the basis for the analysis of the data. No effort has been made to determine an acceptable frequency count for a particular behavior; indeed that **should not be done** because of the varying nature of the lessons observed. What has been done, however, is to determine the changes made from the first to the third observation. In other words, did the intern increase the frequency of positive behaviors and reduce the number of negative behaviors based on the observations of the three-person internship team?

An analysis was made for all interns. In addition, a separate analysis was completed for each of the major certification fields, as follows:

(1) interns in early elementary education (1-4); kindergarten interns were not included because difficulty with the coding procedures.

(2) interns in the middle grades (5-8);

(3) interns in the secondary grades (9-12);

(4) special education interns; and

(5) vocational education interns.

For the purposes of this paper, however, only the category "all interns" was used.

A study of Kentucky's internship program during the past two year period has resulted in varied outcomes across teacher groups. The study addresses the teacher behaviors during instruction and during seatwork. Tables 1 through 16 report the mean frequencies

of each behavior for the first and third observations. These tables reflect the behaviors for "all interns," regardless of the grade level/subject.

No attempt is made to present minimum frequencies for each observation and each behavior. This study is a report of "what is" and the changes that occurred from the first to the third observation.

Following the frequency of the third observation for each behavior, a letter "P" or "N" appears. The "P" indicates that the direction of the change in behavior is conducive to improved instruction, while the "N" indicates the direction of the change is not beneficial to instruction. In many cases the difference is slight. The behaviors where the difference is significant at the .05 level have an asterisk by the "P" or "N". In the analysis following the tables, an increase or decrease identified as being significant, is statistically significant at the .05 level.

The six categories follow; the teacher behaviors listed under each are coded on the observation instrument:

TEACHER BEHAVIORS

I. Communications:
- Cues students
- Uses emphasis
- Uses challenge/task attractions
- Uses sarcasm/negative Affect

II. Questioning Techniques:
- Asks academic questions
- Asks multiple questions
- Allows call-outs
- Does not provide wait time
- Guides reciter
- Does not guide reciter
- Asks procedural questions
- Asks unrelated questions

III. Responses:
- Acknowledges student responses
- Rephrases/amplifies student responses
- Corrects/clarifies student responses
- Does not correct/clarify responses

IV. Praise:
- Uses specific academic praise
- Uses general academic praise
- Uses group academic praise

V. Management: During Instruction and During Seatwork:
- Uses specific conduct-related praise
- Stops misconduct positively
- Stops misconduct negatively
- Does not stop misconduct
- Manages overlapping events

VI. Time: During Instruction and During Seatwork:
- Minimizes management time
- Mismanages instructional time

Category I: Communication

Teachers who present subject matter content in an organized manner employing correct grammar, clear, concise sentence structures at appropriate academic levels, and avoiding words that connote vagueness and/or scrambled

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

discourse increase the likelihood of student achievement. (Knowledge Base for the Kentucky Teacher Internship Program, hereafter labeled "Knowledge Base".) Tables 1 and 2 reflect the results of the coding for the first and third observation for Communications.

Table 1

Mean Frequency for Communications (1989-1990)

	All Interns		
	Observation		
TEACHER BEHAVIORS	NO. 1	NO. 3	P/N
1 Cues Students	3.24	2.91	N*
2 Uses Emphasis	1.78	1.65	N*
3 Uses Challenge/Task Attention	1.20	1.16	N
4 Uses Sarcasm/Negative Affect	0.08	0.09	N

P Positive Behavior Change from 1st to 3rd Observation
N Negative Behavior Change from 1st to 3rd Observation
*Significant at the .05 Level

Table 2

Mean Frequency for Communications (1990-1991)

TEACHER BEHAVIORS	All Interns Observation NO. 1	NO. 3	P/N
1 Cues Students	3.23	3.08	N*
2 Uses Emphasis	1.60	1.68	P
3 Uses Challenge/Task Attention	1.04	1.07	P
4 Uses Sarcasm/Negative Affect	0.25	0.28	N

P Positive Behavior Change from 1st to 3rd Observation
N Negative Behavior Change from 1st to 3rd Observation
*Significant at the .05 Level

Communication: Cues Students

INTENT: *To identify those occasions when the intern uses verbal cues to establish and maintain the lesson's academic focus or to keep students mentally involved in the lesson.* (Manual for Coding Teacher Behaviors with the Kentucky Teacher Internship Program, Classroom Observation Instrument, hereafter labeled "The Manual".)

For 1989-1990 and 1990-1991, "Cues students" decreased significantly from the first to the third observation in frequency. Since an increase in frequency from the first to third observation would be considered desirable for a more positive learning environment, "Cues student" was considered a negative for the total intern population.

Communication: Uses Emphasis

INTENT: *To identify those occasions when the intern uses verbal statements or nonverbal actions or gestures to call attention to important aspects of the lesson content.* (The Manual)

The first year of the study reflected a significant decrease for all groups in the use of emphasis. During the second year, 1990-1991, the use of emphasis increased from the first to the third observation, but the increase was not significant.

Communication: Uses Challenge/Task Attraction

INTENT: *To identify occasions when the intern uses statements designed to challenge and motivate students to become involved with the lesson.* (The Manual)

A positive outcome would result when the mean frequency of the third observation exceeded the first observation. During 1989-1990, the frequency for this behavior decreased, but not significantly. For 1990-1991, there was an increase, but this increase was not significant.

Communication: Uses Sarcasm/Negative Affect

INTENT: *To identify those occasions when the intern uses harsh words or sarcasm with an individual student or the class regarding their academic performance.* (The Manual)
The climate for learning would improve if this behavior decreased from the first to the third observation. For the total group the frequency of this behavior increased from the first to third observation. While the difference was not significant, the direction of the change was considered negative.

Category II: Questioning Techniques

Teachers who ask frequent and clear academic questions increase the likelihood of student achievement of the material. (Knowledge Base) Tables 3 and 4 give the data on "Questioning Techniques" for both years of the study.

Table 3

Mean Frequency for Questioning Techniques (1989-1990)

TEACHER BEHAVIORS	All Interns Observation NO. 1	NO. 3	P/N
1 Asks Academic Questions	22.48	22.40	N
2 Asks Multiple Questions	2.30	1.47	P*
3 Allows Call-outs	2.45	1.65	P*
4 Does Not Provide Wait Time	0.52	0.25	P*
5 Guides Reciter	3.25	3.21	N
6 Does Not Guide Reciter	0.20	0.12	P*
7 Asks Procedural Questions	2.14	1.51	P*
8 Asks Unrelated Questions	0.23	0.13	P*

P Positive Behavior Change from 1st to 3rd Observation
N Negative Behavior Change from 1st to 3rd Observation
*Significant at the .05 Level

Table 4

Mean Frequency for Questioning Techniques (1990-1991)

TEACHER BEHAVIORS	All Interns Observation NO. 1	NO. 3	P/N
1 Asks Academic Questions	22.45	21.17	N*
2 Asks Multiple Questions	2.06	1.23	P*
3 Allows Call-outs	2.74	1.65	P*
4 Does Not Provide Wait Time	0.59	0.28	P*
5 Guides Reciter	3.21	3.29	P
6 Does Not Guide Reciter	0.28	0.12	P*
7 Asks Procedural Questions	1.79	1.33	P*
8 Asks Unrelated Questions	0.27	0.16	P*

P Positive Behavior Change from 1st to 3rd Observation
N Negative Behavior Change from 1st to 3rd Observation
*Significant at the .05 Level

Questioning Techniques: Asks Academic Questions

INTENT: *To identify the frequency with which the intern asks questions or elicits responses related to the lesson content which provides the opportunity to give feedback to the students on their responses.* (The Manual)

To show a positive gain from the first to the third observation, an increase in frequency would be necessary. The total group of interns showed a decline for both years and the 1990-91 decline was significant.

Questioning Techniques: Asks Multiple Questions

INTENT: *To identify the instances when the intern asks a series of questions or repeats the same question before giving students an opportunity to respond.* (The Manual)

A positive response for this behavior would be a decrease in the frequency of this behavior from the first to third observation. The total population (All Interns) was significantly positive for both years.

Questioning Techniques: Allows Call-Outs

INTENT: *To identify the times that the intern allows students to call out answers rather than having a single student respond.* (The Manual)

The frequency of occurrence decreased for each group from the first to third observation for both years of the study. The amount of the decrease for both years was significant. Since a reduction in the number of call-outs is considered desirable, this result is a positive gain.

Questioning Techniques: Does Not Provide Wait Time

INTENT: *To identify those times that the intern does not allow students time to formulate responses before beginning to prompt.* (The Manual)

A decrease in the frequency of this behavior is desirable. The results were both positive and significant since a decrease resulted for both years.

Questioning Techniques: Guides Reciter

INTENT: *To identify those instances when the intern provides assistance to help a student formulate an initial response to an academic question.* (The Manual)

Guiding the reciter is considered a positive behavior. The expectation is that the frequency will increase from the first to third observation. The interns showed a decrease in this behavior in 1989-1990 and an increase in 1990-1991. None of the changes were significant.

Questioning Techniques: Does Not Guide Reciter

INTENT: *To identify those instances when the intern does not help a student formulate an initial response; but instead shifts to another student or answers the question.* (The Manual)

This behavior decreased significantly during both years, which is interpreted as a positive behavior.

Questioning Techniques: Asks Procedural Questions

INTENT: *To identify the frequency with which the intern asks questions which are related to the lesson content or process but not directly related to the mastery of the lesson objectives.* (The Manual)

Since procedural questions are not considered to relate directly to the mastery of the lesson objectives, a decrease in the frequency of this behavior indicates a positive outcome. Indeed, this behavior decreased both years of the study, and the decrease was significant both years.

Questioning Techniques: Asks Unrelated Questions

INTENT: *To identify the frequency with which the intern asks questions which are not related to the lesson content, process, or mastery of objectives.* (The Manual)

A decrease in the frequency of this behavior is considered desirable. A significant decrease occurred for both years of the study.

Summary Observations: Questioning Techniques

For six of the eight behaviors, a positive direction is indicated by a decrease in frequency from the first to third observation. The behaviors "Asks Academic Questions" and "Guides Reciter" contribute to improved learning and an increased frequency from the first to third observation is considered positive.

The six behaviors that are considered positive if the frequencies decrease from the first to the third observation were

all positive for both years and the decrease in frequency was significant for each behavior for both years.

During 1989-1990 both "Asks Academic Questions" and "Guides Reciter" decreased rather than increased; therefore, the results were considered to be negative. "Asks Academic Questions" was also negative for 1990-1991 and the decrease in frequencies was significant. "Guides Reciter" was positive for 1990-1991; however, the increase was not significant.

Category III: Responses

Achievement increases if student responses to teacher initiated queries are acknowledged with rephrasing and amplification where necessary and if incorrect responses are corrected or clarified. (Knowledge Base) Tables 5 and 6 present the data on "Teacher Responses" for both 1989-1990 and 1990-1991.

Table 5

Mean Frequency for Responses (1989-1990)

TEACHER BEHAVIORS	All Interns Observation NO. 1	NO. 3	P/N
1 Acknowledges Student Responses	11.37	11.52	P
2 Rephrases/Amplifies Student Responses	5.70	5.74	P
3 Corrects/Clarifies Student Responses	2.72	2.55	N
4 Does Not Correct/Clarify Responses	0.12	0.10	P

P Positive Behavior Change from 1st to 3rd Observation
N Negative Behavior Change from 1st to 3rd Observation
*Significant at the .05 Level

Table 6

Mean Frequency for Responses (1990-1991)

TEACHER BEHAVIORS	All Interns Observation NO. 1	NO. 3	P/N
1 Acknowledges Student Responses	11.57	11.39	N
2 Rephrases/Amplifies Student Responses	5.85	5.5	N
3 Corrects/Clarifies Student Responses	2.45	2.31	N
4 Does Not Correct/Clarify Responses	0.17	0.11	P*

P Positive Behavior Change from 1st to 3rd Observation
N Negative Behavior Change from 1st to 3rd Observation
*Significant at the .05 Level

Responses: Acknowledges Student Responses

INTENT: *To identify the frequency with which the intern indicates that an answer or response is acceptable by repeating the answer verbatim or making a verbal or nonverbal response which carries no praise value.* (The Manual)

The frequency for "Acknowledges Student Responses" increased from the first to third observation during 1989-1990, but decreased during 1990-1991 for "All Interns". Neither change was significant.

Responses: Rephrases/Amplifies Student Responses

INTENT: *To identify those instances when the intern responds to a student by rephrasing his/her answer or by amplifying or expanding on the student's answer.* (The Manual)

From the first to third observation for 1989-1990, there was an increase in the frequency of rephrasing/amplifying students responses, but there was a decrease for 1990-1991. Neither the increase nor decrease was significant.

Responses: Corrects/Clarifies Student Responses

INTENT: *To identify those times that the intern corrects a student's error in responding, helps the student develop a more complete response, or clarifies material which seems to be misunderstood.* (The Manual)

Interns showed a decline in "Corrects/Clarifies Student Responses" from the first to the third observation for both years of the study The decrease, however, was not significant.

Responses: Does Not Correct/Clarify Responses

INTENT: *To identify those times that the intern does not correct a student's error or clarify misunderstandings of material before moving on with the lesson.* (The Manual)

The only response behavior considered positive in terms of improving achievement is "Does Not Correct/Clarify Responses". The frequency of this behavior decreased from the first to the third observation and the reduction was significant for 1990-1991.

Summary Observations: Responses

All behaviors for Responses were coded negative for the 1989-1990 term. The only positive gain which was significant, was the reduction in the frequency of "Does Not Correct/Clarify Responses" for 1990-1991.

Category IV: Praise

Effective praise for desired academic performance or effort will have a positive effect on student achievement and classroom climate. (Knowledge Base) Tables 7 and 8 detail the frequencies for academic praise.

Table 7

Mean Frequency for Praise (1989-1990)

TEACHER BEHAVIORS	All Interns Observation NO. 1	NO. 3	P/N
1 Uses Specific Academic Praise	2.45	2.61	P
2 Uses General Academic Praise	4.40	3.86	P*
3 Uses Group Academic Praise	0.86	0.81	N

P Positive Behavior Change from 1st to 3rd Observation
N Negative Behavior Change from 1st to 3rd Observation
*Significant at the .05 Level

Table 8

Mean Frequency for Praise (1990-1991)

TEACHER BEHAVIORS	All Interns Observation NO. 1	NO. 3	P/N
1 Uses Specific Academic Praise	2.25	2.48	P
2 Uses General Academic Praise	3.90	3.49	P*
3 Uses Group Academic Praise	0.74	0.75	P

P Positive Behavior Change from 1st to 3rd Observation
N Negative Behavior Change from 1st to 3rd Observation
*Significant at the .05 Level

Praise: Uses Specific Academic Praise

INTENT: *To identify those instances when the intern's praise of an individual student's academic performance conveys the reason for giving the praise or the indication(s) of quality.* (The Manual)

The frequency of the use of specific academic praise increased from the first to third observation for both years. However, this increase was not significant.

Praise: Uses General Academic Praise

INTENT: *To identify those instances when the intern's praise of an individual student's academic performance does not convey why the performance is being praised.* (The Manual)

General academic praise is viewed as a non-positive behavior for improving instruction. Consequently, for this behavior to be considered positive, a decline from the first to third observation must occur. The frequency of this behavior declined significantly for both years of the study.

Praise: Uses Group Academic Praise

INTENT: *To identify those instances when the intern praises the class or a group of students for their academic performance.* (The Manual)

Group academic praise may be used to maintain momentum and/or to have a positive effect on classroom climate. Therefore, the use of group praise is considered a positive behavior change if the frequency increases. The interns did not show a significant gain in either year of the study. For 1989-1990, the change was

in a negative direction, while for 1990-1991 a positive behavior change occurred.

Summary Observations: Academic Praise

The only behavior that had a significant behavior change from the first to third observation was "Uses General Academic Praise." This change was considered to be positive because the frequency of the observed behavior declined over time.

Category IV: Management

Proper use of appropriate conduct-related praise can decrease student off-task behavior. Maintaining student conduct by appropriately stopping student misconduct provides for a more effective learning environment.

The ability to maintain task involvement of students while simultaneously dealing with management concerns promotes student engaged time. (Knowledge Base)

The data for "Management of Student Conduct" are outlined in tables 9, 10, 11, and 12. The specific behaviors are summarized in the following pages.

Table 9

Mean Frequency for Management: During Instruction (1989-1990)

TEACHER BEHAVIORS	All Interns Observation NO. 1	NO. 3	P/N
1 Uses Specific Conduct-related praise	0.58	0.60	P
2 Stops Misconduct Positively	2.54	2.17	N*
3 Stops Misconduct Negatively	0.20	0.13	P*
4 Does Not Stop Misconduct	0.46	0.26	P*
5 Manages Overlapping Events	0.77	0.66	N*

P Positive Behavior Change from 1st to 3rd Observation
N Negative Behavior Change from 1st to 3rd Observation
*Significant at the .05 Level

Table 10

Mean Frequency for Management: During Instruction (1990-1991)

TEACHER BEHAVIORS	All Interns Observation NO. 1	NO. 3	P/N
1 Uses Specific Conduct-related praise	0.68	0.61	N
2 Stops Misconduct Positively	2.19	1.83	N*
3 Stops Misconduct Negatively	0.19	0.10	P*
4 Does Not Stop Misconduct	0.38	0.30	P
5 Manages Overlapping Events	0.78	0.71	N

P Positive Behavior Change from 1st to 3rd Observation
N Negative Behavior Change from 1st to 3rd Observation
*Significant at the .05 Level

Table 11

Mean Frequency for Management: During Seatwork (1989-1990)

TEACHER BEHAVIORS	All Interns Observation NO. 1	NO. 3	P/N
1 Uses Specific Conduct-related praise	0.21	0.20	N
2 Stops Misconduct Positively	0.39	0.30	N*
3 Stops Misconduct Negatively	0.03	0.02	P*
4 Does Not Stop Misconduct	0.11	0.05	P*
5 Manages Overlapping Events	0.15	0.11	N*

P Positive Behavior Change from 1st to 3rd Observation
N Negative Behavior Change from 1st to 3rd Observation
*Significant at the .05 Level

Table 12

Mean Frequency for Management: During Seatwork (1990-1991)

TEACHER BEHAVIORS	All Interns Observation NO. 1	NO. 3	P/N
1 Uses Specific Conduct-related praise	0.23	0.21	N
2 Stops Misconduct Positively	0.47	0.31	N*
3 Stops Misconduct Negatively	0.02	0.02	-
4 Does Not Stop Misconduct	0.10	0.05	P*
5 Manages Overlapping Events	0.11	0.12	P

P Positive Behavior Change from 1st to 3rd Observation
N Negative Behavior Change from 1st to 3rd Observation
*Significant at the .05 Level

Management: Uses Specific Conduct-Related Praise

INTENT: *To identify those times an intern praises an individual or the class for demonstrating specific desired conduct.* (The Manual)

During Instruction: Little consistency between the two years of the study is evidenced in the tabulations. The behavior increased in 1989-1990 and decreased in 1990-1991. Neither change from the first to the third observation was significant for the total population.

During Seatwork: Both years of the study show a negative behavior change for "All Interns" for this behavior. Neither change was significant.

Management: Stops Misconduct Positively

INTENT: *To identify those times the intern stops misconduct or off-task behavior by using minimally disruptive verbal or nonverbal methods.* (The Manual)

During Instruction: "Stops Misconduct Positively" decreased for both years at a significant level for the total population. This would seem to be negative behavior change; however, it could be conjectured that the interns might have established a positive classroom climate in which few cases of misconduct were taking place.

During Seatwork: The frequency of stopping misconduct in a positive manner decreased significantly in both years of the study, a negative behavior change.

Management: Stops Misconduct Negatively

INTENT: *To identify those times the intern reprimands the wrong student, uses sarcasm, roughness, or harshness to stop misconduct or off-task behavior, or leaves opportunity for restart.* (The Manual)

During Instruction: The teacher behavior "Stops Misconduct Negatively" is discouraged in the Kentucky Teacher Internship Program which means a positive behavior change results when the frequency of this behavior declines. The interns showed

a significant and positive behavior change for both years of the study.

During Seatwork: A positive behavior change for this behavior reflects in a decrease in frequency over time. For the year 1989-1990 the behavior was positive and the behavior change was significant. However, in 1990-1991 no behavior change was observed.

Management: Does Not Stop Misconduct

INTENT: *To identify those times the intern does not stop misconduct or off-task behavior or allows misconduct to intensify or spread.* (The Manual)

During Instruction: The frequency of "Does Not Stop Misconduct" decreased both years of the study and the decrease was significant for 1989-1990. Since stopping student misconduct provides a more effective learning environment, the decrease was considered a positive behavior change.

During Seatwork: "Does Not Stop Misconduct" decreased significantly for both years was viewed as a positive behavior change..

Management: Manages Overlapping Events

INTENT: *To identify those times the intern is able to stop misconduct positively or handle an intrusion without interrupting the academic focus of the lesson.* (The Manual)

During Instruction: Interns exhibited a negative change of behavior for both years. The change was significant for 1989-1990.

During Seatwork: The results differed for the two years of the study. During 1989-1990 the interns were recorded as managing overlapping events less frequently over time, a decrease that was viewed as a negative behavior change. The result was significant. For 1990-1991, the behavior change was positive but not significant.

SUMMARY OBSERVATIONS: MANAGEMENT

During Instruction: The frequency of "Stops Misconduct Positively" did not increase. In fact, this behavior decreased and the decrease was significant both years of the study.

"Stops Misconduct Negatively" decreased significantly in both 1989-1990 and 1990-1991.

"Uses Specific Conduct-Related Praise" increased in 1989-1990 and decreased in 1990-1991.

"Does Not Stop Misconduct" was positive (that is, it decreased) both years, but the change was significant only in 1989-1990.

The frequency of "Manages overlapping events" decreased over time, which is viewed as a negative behavior change.

During Seatwork: One behavior, "Does Not Stop Misconduct," can be viewed as a positive change and showed a decrease in frequency of occurrence.

Category VI: Time

Minimizing management time and effectively managing instructional time increases the time available for

teaching and learning. (Knowledge Base) The results of the coding for time management during instruction are found in Tables 13, 14, 15, and 16.

Table 13

Mean Frequency for Use of Time: During Instruction (1989-1990)

TEACHER BEHAVIORS	All Interns		
	Observation		
	NO. 1	NO. 3	P/N
1 Minimizes Management Time	1.15	0.98	N*
2 Mismanages Instructional Time	0.18	0.09	P*

P Positive Behavior Change from 1st to 3rd Observation
N Negative Behavior Change from 1st to 3rd Observation
*Significant at the .05 Level

Table 14

Mean Frequency for Time: During Instruction (1990-1991)

TEACHER BEHAVIORS	All Interns		
	Observation		
	NO. 1	NO. 3	P/N
1 Minimizes Management Time	1.03	0.99	N
2 Mismanages Instructional Time	0.15	0.09	P*

P Positive Behavior Change from 1st to 3rd Observation
N Negative Behavior Change from 1st to 3rd Observation
*Significant at the .05 Level

Table 15

Mean Frequency for Use of Time: During Seatwork (1989-1990)

TEACHER BEHAVIORS	All Interns		
	Observation		
	NO. 1	NO. 3	P/N
1 Minimizes Management Time	0.11	0.10	N
2 Mismanages Instructional Time	0.02	0.01	P

P Positive Behavior Change from 1st to 3rd Observation
N Negative Behavior Change from 1st to 3rd Observation
*Significant at the .05 Level

Table 16

Mean Frequency for Time: During Seatwork (1990-1991)

TEACHER BEHAVIORS	All Interns		
	Observation		
	NO. 1	NO. 3	P/N
1 Minimizes Management Time	0.20	0.16	N
2 Mismanages Instructional Time	0.02	0.01	P*

P Positive Behavior Change from 1st to 3rd Observation
N Negative Behavior Change from 1st to 3rd Observation
*Significant at the .05 Level

Time: Minimizes Management Time

INTENT: *To identify those instances where the intern attends to classroom routines and nonacademic tasks with an economy of time.* (The Manual)

During Instruction: Since minimizing management time increases the time available for teaching and learning, a positive behavior change from the first to the third observation is shown when the frequency of occurrence decreases. For both years of the study this did not happen. As a consequence, 1989-1990 and 1990-1991 were both listed as negative, and the difference for 1989-1990 was significant.

During Seatwork: This behavior did not change significantly for either year of the study.

Time: Mismanages Instructional Time

INTENT: *To identify those instances where the intern's inefficient preparation and/or use of materials causes the class to lose academic focus, where any intern behavior (or lack of behavior) interferes with the pacing of the lesson, or where the intern spends time on a topic unrelated to the lesson.* (The Manual)

During Instruction: Mismanaging instructional time reduces the time available for teaching and learning. A positive behavior change occurs when the frequency of this behavior decreases. Interns showed a positive and significant behavior change for "Mismanages Instructional Time" for both years of the study.

During Seatwork: The frequency of this behavior decreased for both years in the study. The decrease was significant for 1990-1991.

SUMMARY OBSERVATION: TIME MANAGEMENT

During Instruction: The behavior change that required a decrease in frequency from observation one to observation three was positive and significant. The behavior "Minimizes Management Time" is considered a positive change when the frequency of occurrence increases over time. This increase did not occur.

During Seatwork: A positive change was expected and observed for "Mismanages Instructional Time," which decreased over time. An increase in frequency was expected as a positive behavior change, "Minimizes Management Time", but did not occur.

Correlation of NTE with Teaching Behaviors

When the Kentucky teacher testing and internship program was initially conceived in the early 1980's, the framers of the package that became legislation in 1984 envisioned two distinct measures of the candidates for initial teacher certification: 1) a paper-and-pencil test of the new teacher's knowledge base; and 2) a one-year internship to judge actual classroom performance. It was believed that these two measures would be independent with little or no correlation between them.

The State Board for Elementary and Secondary Education chose the NTE as the paper-and-pencil test. Intern candidates were required to pass successfully all three sections of the core battery of the NTE, plus the specialty test that coincided with their teaching major before they would be eligible to enter the internship program. Initially, Kentucky utilized the Florida Performance Measurement System (FPMS) to measure classroom behaviors of teachers in the internship program. When he tabulated the tallies from the FPMS observation instruments and correlated those data with the NTE scores, Pankratz (1987) found no strong correlation in the two measures.

In 1989, Kentucky moved from the Florida Performance Measurement System to the Kentucky Teacher Internship Program. A new knowledge base was developed, an intern observation form was devised, and a coding manual to be used in observing the intern was written. The new observation form was called the Classroom Observation Instrument (COI). Although the initial study

completed in 1987 by Pankratz found no correlation between the NTE and the teacher behavior measures identified on the FPMS, it was felt that additional data should be analyzed regarding the COI. Each of the three sections of the NTE Core Battery was correlated with each of the teaching behaviors identified on the COI. A complete breakdown of these correlations for Grades 1-4, 5-8, 9-12, special education, and vocational education for the two-year period, 1989-90 and 1990-91, is shown in Tables 17-21. In all cases, the correlation coefficients are very low. It was concluded that the COI and the NTE are measuring two different behaviors of the beginning teacher, as was originally conceived.

Mean ACT Scores for Successful and Unsuccessful Interns

Another measure of the independence of knowledge tests and performance, the two measures for the beginning teacher, was to examine the relationship between the mean ACT scores for successful and unsuccessful interns. Table 33 summarizes these data. Although the mean scores for each of the ACT subtests and the composite score was higher for successful interns, the n for unsuccessful interns was too small to determine whether this difference is significant.

Table 17

Correlation of NTE Core Battery Tests with Communication (1989-1990)

	Grades 1 thru 4			Grades 5 thru 8			Grades 9 thru 12			Sp. Edu.			Voc. Edu.			All Interns		
	Correlation			Correlation			Correlation			Correlation			Correlation			Correlation		
TEACHER BEHAVIORS	CS	GK	PK	CS	GK	PK	CS	GK	PK	CS	GK	PK	CS	GK	PK	CS	GK	PK
1 Cues Students	0.01	-0.02	-0.03	0.00	-0.02	-0.02	-0.01	-0.03	-0.01	-0.02	-0.01	-0.01	0.02	0.03	0.04	0.00	-0.03*	-0.02
2 Uses Emphasis	0.02	-0.02	-0.01	-0.01	-0.04*	-0.06*	-0.04	-0.06*	-0.06*	0.00	-0.07	0.01	0.09	-0.18	-0.05	0.00	-0.03*	-0.04*
3 Uses Challenge/Task Attention	0.04*	0.01	0.03	-0.02	0.01	-0.04*	0.01	-0.04	0.02	0.02	-0.03	0.03	0.07	-0.06	0.10	0.00	-0.03*	0.00
4 Uses Sarcasm/Negative Affect	0.00	0.01	0.01	-0.02	0.00	-0.02	-0.05*	-0.01	-0.03	-0.11*	-0.08*	-0.11*	-0.01	-0.10	-0.02	-0.01	0.00	0.00

CS = Communication Skills Test

GK = General Knowledge Test

PK = Professional Knowledge Test

*Significant at the .05 level

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 18

Correlation of NTE Core Battery Tests with Communication (1990-1991)

	Grades 1 thru 4			Grades 5 thru 8			Grades 9 thru 12			Sp. Edu.			Voc. Edu.			All Interns		
	Correlation			Correlation			Correlation			Correlation			Correlation			Correlation		
TEACHER BEHAVIORS	CS	GK	PK	CS	GK	PK	CS	GK	PK	CS	GK	PK	CS	GK	PK	CS	GK	PK
1 Cues Students	-0.08*	-0.09*	-0.11*	-0.03	-0.06*	-0.03	0.01	-0.04	-0.03	-0.05	0.00	0.00	.04	-0.12	0.00	-0.04*	-0.08*	-0.06*
2 Uses Emphasis	-0.03	-0.09*	-0.09*	0.07*	0.00	0.01	-0.01	0.00	0.02	-0.05	-0.08*	-0.01	0.06	-0.01	0.18	0.00	-0.04*	-0.02
3 Uses Challenge/Task Attention	-0.05	-0.09*	-0.10*	0.10*	0.05	0.06*	-0.01	0.00	0.00	-0.02	-0.05	-0.02	0.16	0.02	0.18*	-0.01	-0.06*	-0.02
4 Uses Sarcasm/Negative Affect	-0.03	-0.01	-0.02	0.00	-0.01	0.02	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.07	0.05	0.03	0.04	0.03	-0.01	-0.02	-0.01	0.00

CS = Communication Skills Test
GK = General Knowledge Test
PK = Professional Knowledge Test
*Significant at the .05 level

Table 19

Correlation of NTE Core Battery Tests with Questioning Technique (1989-1990)

TEACHER BEHAVIORS	Grades 1 thru 4			Grades 5 thru 8			Grades 9 thru 12			Sp. Edu.			Voc. Edu.			All Interns		
	Correlation			Correlation			Correlation			Correlation			Correlation			Correlation		
	CS	GK	PK	CS	GK	PK	CS	GK	PK	CS	GK	PK	CS	GK	PK	CS	GK	PK
1 Asks Academic Questions	0.02	-0.01	0.02	0.04*	-0.01	0.05*	0.11*	0.05*	0.05*	0.12*	0.04	0.09*	0.05	-0.03	0.07	0.02	-0.04*	0.04*
2 Asks Multiple Questions	0.01	-0.02	-0.01	0.03	0.02	0.01	0.07*	0.08*	0.07*	0.04	-0.01	0.00	-0.10	-0.05	-0.07	0.03	0.01	0.02
3 Allows Call-outs	-0.03	-0.01	-0.03	0.04*	0.05*	0.04*	0.08*	0.13*	0.07*	-0.04	-0.03	-0.01	-0.20*	0.06	-0.11	0.04*	0.08*	0.03*
4 Does Not Provide Wait Time	-0.02	-0.03	-0.01	0.03	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.00	0.03	0.04	0.02	0.09	-0.02	0.15	0.02	0.01	0.01
5 Guides Reciter	-0.04	-0.07*	-0.03	0.02	0.00	0.03	0.00	-0.04	0.00	-0.04	-0.10*	-0.02	-0.11	-0.02	-0.04	-0.01	-0.06*	0.00
6 Does Not Guide Reciter	0.01	0.00	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.05*	0.04	0.03	-0.05	0.00	-0.01	0.07	-0.03	0.03	0.01	0.01	0.02
7 Asks Procedural Questions	0.00	-0.02	-0.01	-0.04*	-0.02	-0.01	0.01	-0.01	0.01	0.00	-0.05	0.02	0.04	0.26*	-0.14	-0.02*	-0.03*	-0.01
8 Asks Unrelated Questions	-0.01	0.00	0.02	-0.01	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.00	-0.01	0.02	0.01	0.03	-0.14	0.07	-0.09	0.00	0.00	0.01

CS = Communication Skills Test
GK = General Knowledge Test
PK = Professional Knowledge Test
*Significant at the .05 level

Table 20

Correlation of NTE Core Battery Tests with Questioning Technique (1990-1991)

TEACHER BEHAVIORS	Grades 1 thru 4 Correlation			Grades 5 thru 8 Correlation			Grades 9 thru 12 Correlation			Sp. Edu. Correlation			Voc. Edu. Correlation			All Interns Correlation		
	CS	GK	PK	CS	GK	PK	CS	GK	PK	CS	GK	PK	CS	GK	PK	CS	GK	PK
1 Asks Academic Questions	-0.01	-0.01	-0.02	0.09*	0.01	0.05	0.13	0.10*	0.12*	0.06	0.00	0.03	-0.09	-0.05	-0.08	0.06*	0.00	0.06*
2 Asks Multiple Questions	0.06*	0.07*	0.05	0.05	-0.02	0.02	-0.01	0.07*	0.04	0.00	-0.04	0.03	-0.05	-0.14	-0.02	0.03	0.04*	0.03*
3 Allows Call-outs	0.03	0.08*	0.03	0.08*	0.06*	0.07*	0.03	0.07*	0.03	-0.01	0.03	0.00	0.02	-0.02	0.03	0.06*	0.11*	0.04*
4 Does Not Provide Wait Time	0.02	0.07*	0.02	0.08*	0.04	0.07*	-0.05	0.02	-0.02	0.10*	0.07	0.09*	-0.11	-0.21*	-0.19*	0.02	0.05*	0.02
5 Guides Reciter	-0.05	-0.07*	-0.06*	0.00	-0.05	0.00	0.02	0.04	0.06*	0.00	0.00	-0.05	-0.13	-0.22*	0.02	-0.03	-0.06*	-0.01
6 Does Not Guide Reciter	0.00	-0.01	-0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.03	0.05	0.02	0.03	0.00	-0.18*	-0.17*	-0.18*	0.01	0.02	0.02
7 Asks Procedural Questions	-0.05	-0.04	-0.05	0.01	-0.03	-0.01	-0.07*	0.01	-0.04	-0.01	-0.04	0.01	-0.08	-0.24*	-0.09	-0.04*	-0.04*	-0.04*
8 Asks Unrelated Questions	0.07*	-0.09*	0.06*	-0.09	-0.07*	-0.05	-0.06*	0.00	-0.06*	0.02	0.02	-0.02	0.07	0.09	0.12	-0.04*	-0.01	-0.02

CS = Communication Skills Test
GK = General Knowledge Test
PK = Professional Knowledge Test
*Significant at the .05 level

43

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 21

Correlation of NTE Core Battery Tests with Responses (1989-1990)

TEACHER BEHAVIORS	Grades 1 thru 4 Correlation			Grades 5 thru 8 Correlation			Grades 9 thru 12 Correlation			Sp. Edu. Correlation			Voc. Edu. Correlation			All Interns Correlation		
	CS	GK	PK	CS	GK	PK	CS	GK	PK	CS	GK	PK	CS	GK	PK	CS	GK	PK
1 Acknowledges Student Responses	0.00	0.00	0.04	0.00	-0.03	0.00	0.04	-0.03	-0.01	0.07*	0.01	0.08*	0.04	-0.05	0.05	-0.01	-0.06	0.01
2 Rephrases/Amplifies Student Responses	0.00	-0.03	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.09*	0.03	0.04*	0.12*	0.01	0.01	-0.01	0.08	0.07	0.02	-0.01	0.02
3 Corrects/Clarifies Student Responses	0.02	-0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02	-0.03	0.00	0.01	-0.04	-0.03	0.03	0.09	-0.02	0.01	-0.02	0.01
4 Does Not Correct/Clarify Responses	0.00	-0.01	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.03	0.01	0.03	0.00	0.02	-0.02	0.05	-0.09	-0.04	-0.06	0.00	0.00	0.02

CS = Communication Skills Test

GK = General Knowledge Test

PK = Professional Knowledge Test

*Significant at the .05 level

Table 22

Correlation of NTE Core Battery Tests with Responses (1990-1991)

TEACHER BEHAVIORS	Grades 1 thru 4			Grades 5 thru 8			Grades 9 thru 12			Sp. Edu.			Voc. Edu.			All Interns		
	Correlation			Correlation			Correlation			Correlation			Correlation			Correlation		
	CS	GK	PK	CS	GK	PK	CS	GK	PK	CS	GK	PK	CS	GK	PK	CS	GK	PK
1 Acknowledges Student Responses	-0.01	-0.03	-0.04	0.04	-0.04	0.00	0.11*	0.06*	0.11*	0.04	-0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.08	0.02	-0.05	0.02
2 Rephrases/Amplifies Student Responses	0.04	0.00	0.01	0.07	0.00	0.02	0.04	0.01	0.04	-0.01	-0.05	-0.02	0.06	-0.10	0.06	0.04	-0.01	0.02
3 Corrects/Clarifies Student Responses	-0.02	-0.05	-0.01	0.10	0.05	0.08*	0.01	-0.01	0.00	0.00	-0.02	-0.04	-0.07	-0.12	-0.08	0.02	-0.02	0.02
4 Does Not Correct/Clarify Responses	0.05	0.04	0.03	0.05	0.08*	0.05	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.05	0.04	0.05	0.05	-0.08	0.10	0.03	0.04*	0.03

CS = Communication Skills Test
GK = General Knowledge Test
PK = Professional Knowledge Test
*Significant at the .05 level

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 23

Correlation of NTE Core Battery Tests with Praise (1989-1990)

TEACHER BEHAVIORS	Grades 1 thru 4			Grades 5 thru 8			Grades 9 thru 12			Sp. Edu.			Voc. Edu.			All Interns		
	Correlation			Correlation			Correlation			Correlation			Correlation			Correlation		
	CS	GK	PK	CS	GK	PK	CS	GK	PK	CS	GK	PK	CS	GK	PK	CS	GK	PK
1 Uses Specific Academic Praise	0.01	-0.02	0.03	0.01	-0.05	-0.02	-0.06	-0.12	-0.06	0.01	-0.08	0.04	0.09	-0.10	0.06	-0.02	-0.09*	-0.01
2 Uses General Academic Praise	-0.01	-0.04	0.00	-0.20	-0.08	-0.02	0.01	-0.07	0.00	0.00	-0.03	0.04	0.14	-0.15	0.07	-0.03	-0.10*	-0.01
3 Uses Group Academic Praise	0.03	-0.01	-0.01	-0.04	-0.07	-0.04	-0.03	-0.04*	-0.04	0.03	-0.04	-0.02	0.05	0.03	0.18*	-0.02	-0.07*	-0.03*

CS = Communication Skills Test

GK = General Knowledge Test

PK = Professional Knowledge Test

*Significant at the .05 level

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 24

Correlation of NTE Core Battery Tests with Praise (1990-1991)

	Grades 1 thru 4			Grades 5 thru 8			Grades 9 thru 12			Sp. Edu.			Voc. Edu.			All Interns		
	Correlation			Correlation			Correlation			Correlation			Correlation			Correlation		
TEACHER BEHAVIORS	CS	GK	PK	CS	GK	PK	CS	GK	PK	CS	GK	PK	CS	GK	PK	CS	GK	PK
1 Uses Specific Academic Praise	0.01	-0.03	-0.02	-0.02	-0.05	-0.01	-0.01	-0.04	0.01	-0.07	-0.06	-0.06	0.15	-0.03	0.04	-0.04*	-0.10*	-0.02
2 Uses General Academic Praise	0.01	-0.04	-0.03	-0.02	-0.11*	-0.04	0.04	-0.02	0.04	0.04	0.01	-0.02	0.16	-0.04	0.15	-0.02	-0.12*	-0.02
3 Uses Group Academic Praise	0.02	-0.05	-0.05	-0.01	-0.07*	-0.90*	-0.10*	-0.11*	-0.10*	-0.07	-0.06	-0.06	0.15	0.13	0.21*	-0.05*	-0.11*	-0.08*

CS = Communication Skills Test
GK = General Knowledge Test
PK = Professional Knowledge Test
*Significant at the .05 level

Table 25

Correlation of NTE Core Battery Tests with Management: During Instruction (1989-1990)

TEACHER BEHAVIORS	Grades 1 thru 4			Grades 5 thru 8			Grades 9 thru 12			Sp. Edu.			Voc. Edu.			All Interns		
	Correlation			Correlation			Correlation			Correlation			Correlation			Correlation		
	CS	GK	PK	CS	GK	PK	CS	GK	PK	CS	GK	PK	CS	GK	PK	CS	GK	PK
1 Uses Specific Conduct-related praise	0.08*	0.04*	0.07*	0.03	0.00	0.04	-0.08*	-0.09*	-0.02	0.09*	0.02	0.13*	-0.14	0.01	-0.09	0.02	-0.03	0.05
2 Stops Misconduct Positively	0.06*	0.06*	0.07*	0.09*	0.06*	0.08*	0.05*	0.03	0.04	0.04	-0.02	0.04	0.03	0.15	0.00	0.05	0.01	0.06
3 Stops Misconduct Negatively	0.01	0.00	-0.02	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.04	-0.01	0.02	0.00	0.03	0.12	0.13	0.03	0.01	0.02	-0.01
4 Does Not Stop Misconduct	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.06*	0.08*	0.05*	0.06*	0.08*	0.07*	0.06	0.03	0.03	-0.10	0.08	0.07	0.05*	0.07*	0.05*
5 Manages Overlapping Events	0.02	0.02	0.03*	-0.01	-0.02	0.00	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.02	-0.01	0.00	-0.03	0.18*	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.01

CS = Communication Skills Test
GK = General Knowledge Test
PK = Professional Knowledge Test
*Significant at the .05 level

Table 26

Correlation of NTE Core Battery Tests with Management: During Instruction (1990-1991)

TEACHER BEHAVIORS	Grades 1 thru 4 Correlation			Grades 5 thru 8 Correlation			Grades 9 thru 12 Correlation			Sp. Edu. Correlation			Voc. Edu. Correlation			All Interns Correlation		
	CS	GK	PK	CS	GK	PK	CS	GK	PK	CS	GK	PK	CS	GK	PK	CS	GK	PK
1 Uses Specific Conduct-related praise	0.14*	0.08*	0.13*	0.01	-0.03	0.07*	-0.02	-0.12*	-0.07*	0.04	0.01	0.10*	0.04	-0.14	0.04	0.03*	-0.05*	0.06*
2 Stops Misconduct Positively	0.09*	0.07*	0.14*	0.15	0.13*	0.17*	0.08*	0.04	0.08*	0.09*	0.07*	0.17*	-0.25*	-0.14	-0.26*	0.09*	0.05*	0.12*
3 Stops Misconduct Negatively	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.01	0.02	-0.01	0.02	0.03	0.00	0.07	0.10*	0.07	-0.06	-0.25	-0.15	0.02	0.02	0.00
4 Does Not Stop Misconduct	0.00	0.08*	0.01	0.13*	0.12*	0.09*	0.03	0.01	0.06*	0.00	0.10*	0.00	0.00	0.01	-0.01	0.05*	0.08*	0.05*
5 Manages Overlapping Events	0.05	-0.02	0.01	-0.01	-0.04	0.05	-0.03	-0.07*	-0.02	-0.01	-0.01	0.07*	-0.15	-0.29*	-0.13	-0.01	-0.06*	0.01

CS = Communication Skills Test
GK = General Knowledge Test
PK = Professional Knowledge Test
*Significant at the .05 level

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 27

Correlation of NTE Core Battery Tests with Time: During Instruction (1989-1990)

TEACHER BEHAVIORS	Grades 1 thru 4			Grades 5 thru 8			Grades 9 thru 12			Sp. Edu.			Voc. Edu.			All Interns		
	Correlation			Correlation			Correlation			Correlation			Correlation			Correlation		
	CS	GK	PK	CS	GK	PK	CS	GK	PK	CS	GK	PK	CS	GK	PK	CS	GK	PK
1 Minimizes Management Time	0.01	0.04*	0.02	-0.03	-0.02	-0.03	0.04	-0.01	0.02	0.06	-0.03	0.04	0.02	0.00	0.02	-0.01	-0.01	0.00
2 Mismanages Instructional Time	0.00	-0.02	-0.01	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.00	0.02	-0.04	0.00	0.04	0.07	-0.06	0.00	0.00	0.00

CS = Communication Skills Test

GK = General Knowledge Test

PK = Professional Knowledge Test

*Significant at the .05 level

Table 28

Correlation of NTE Core Battery Tests with Time: During Instruction (1990-1991)

TEACHER BEHAVIORS	Grades 1 thru 4			Grades 5 thru 8			Grades 9 thru 12			Sp. Edu.			Voc. Edu.			All Interns		
	Correlation			Correlation			Correlation			Correlation			Correlation			Correlation		
	CS	GK	PK	CS	GK	PK	CS	GK	PK	CS	GK	PK	CS	GK	PK	CS	GK	PK
1 Minimizes Management Time	0.02	-0.08*	-0.02	0.05	0.01	0.06	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.06	-0.03	0.07	-0.02	-0.12	-0.10	0.00	-0.05*	0.01
2 Mismanages Instructional Time	-0.01	0.06	0.00	0.04	0.04	0.00	-0.03	0.02	-0.02	0.00	0.09	-0.01	-0.03	-0.09	0.00	0.00	0.04*	0.01

CS = Communication Skills Test
GK = General Knowledge Test
PK = Professional Knowledge Test
*Significant at the .05 level

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 29

Correlation of NTE Core Battery Tests with Management: During Seatwork (1989-1990)

TEACHER BEHAVIORS	Grades 1 thru 4 Correlation			Grades 5 thru 8 Correlation			Grades 9 thru 12 Correlation			Sp. Edu. Correlation			Voc. Edu. Correlation			All Interns Correlation		
	CS	GK	PK	CS	GK	PK	CS	GK	PK	CS	GK	PK	CS	GK	PK	CS	GK	PK
1 Uses Specific Conduct-related praise	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.01	-0.01	-0.01	0.06*	-0.06*	-0.02	0.05	-0.03	0.07*	0.04	0.11	-0.13	-0.01	-0.03	-0.01
2 Stops Misconduct Positively	0.06*	0.02	0.02	0.05*	0.03	0.07*	0.07*	0.04*	0.06*	0.12	0.01	0.05	0.11	0.16	0.04	0.05*	0.01	0.05*
3 Stops Misconduct Negatively	0.01	-0.02	-0.01	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.04	0.02	0.01	0.03	-0.02	0.00	-0.06	0.07	-0.12	0.02	0.01	0.00
4 Does Not Stop Misconduct	0.03	0.00	-0.01	0.05*	0.05*	0.05*	0.06*	0.04	0.04	0.06	0.03	0.01	0.04	0.02	0.03	0.05*	0.04*	0.03*
5 Manages Overlapping Events	0.03*	0.03	0.02	-0.02	-0.03	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.05*	0.04	-0.06	0.04	0.12	0.16	0.10	0.10	0.00	0.02

CS = Communication Skills Test
GK = General Knowledge Test
PK = Professional Knowledge Test
*Significant at the .05 level

Table 30

Correlation of NTE Core Battery Tests with Management: During Seatwork (1990-1991)

TEACHER BEHAVIORS	Grades 1 thru 4			Grades 5 thru 8			Grades 9 thru 12			Sp. Edu.			Voc. Edu.			All Interns		
	Correlation			Correlation			Correlation			Correlation			Correlation			Correlation		
	CS	GK	PK	CS	GK	PK	CS	GK	PK	CS	GK	PK	CS	GK	PK	CS	GK	PK
1 Uses Specific Conduct-related praise	0.05	0.05	0.03	0.00	-0.02	0.02	0.01	0.03	0.03	0.05	0.06	0.05	0.00	-0.09	-0.04	0.01	0.00	0.02
2 Stops Misconduct Positively	0.03	-0.01	0.01	-0.01	-0.01	-0.02	0.03	0.00	0.02	0.03	0.00	-0.04	-0.13	-0.12	-0.16	0.01	-0.01	0.00
3 Stops Misconduct Negatively	0.00	0.02	0.01	0.06	0.05	0.05	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.03	0.16	0.05	-	-	-	0.02	0.03	0.02
4 Does Not Stop Misconduct	0.04	0.08*	0.04	0.06	0.03	0.06	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.12*	-0.01	0.08	0.14	0.07	0.04*	0.05*	0.04
5 Manages Overlapping Events	0.01	0.01	-0.02	0.01	-0.02	0.04	-0.02	-0.05	0.01	0.02	0.05	0.03	-0.09	-0.17	-0.14	0.00	-0.02	0.01

CS = Communication Skills Test
GK = General Knowledge Test
PK = Professional Knowledge Test
*Significant at the .05 level
N = Too small to calculate correlation

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 31

Correlation of NTE Core Battery Tests with Time: During Seatwork (1989-1990)

	Grades 1 thru 4			Grades 5 thru 8			Grades 9 thru 12			Sp. Edu.			Voc. Edu.			All Interns		
	Correlation			Correlation			Correlation			Correlation			Correlation			Correlation		
TEACHER BEHAVIORS	CS	GK	PK	CS	GK	PK	CS	GK	PK	CS	GK	PK	CS	GK	PK	CS	GK	PK
1 Minimizes Management Time	0.01	-0.03	0.01	-0.01	-0.01	0.00	0.01	-0.02	0.02	0.08*	-0.02	0.08*	0.11	0.04	-0.06	0.00	-0.02	0.01
2 Mismanages Instructional Time	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.04	0.02	0.03	0.04	0.01	0.00	-	-	-	0.07	0.01	0.01

CS = Communication Skills Test
GK = General Knowledge Test
PK = Professional Knowledge Test
*Significant at the .05 level
N = Too Small to Calculate correlation

Table 32

Correlation of NTE Core Battery Tests with Time: During Seatwork (1990-1991)

TEACHER BEHAVIORS	Grades 1 thru 4			Grades 5 thru 8			Grades 9 thru 12			Sp. Edu.			Voc. Edu.			All Interns		
	Correlation			Correlation			Correlation			Correlation			Correlation			Correlation		
	CS	GK	PK	CS	GK	PK	CS	GK	PK	CS	GK	PK	CS	GK	PK	CS	GK	PK
1 Minimizes Management Time	-0.02	-0.06	-0.08	-0.02	-0.04	-0.03	0.06*	-0.01	0.01	0.04	-0.04	-0.05	-0.08	-0.19*	-0.08	-0.01	-0.04*	-0.04
2 Mismanages Instructional Time	0.00	-0.01	-0.03	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.05	0.03	-	-	-	0.01	0.02	0.02

CS = Communication Skills Test
GK = General Knowledge Test
PK = Professional Knowledge Test
*Significant at the .05 level
N = Too small to calculate correlation

Table 33

Mean ACT Scores for Successful and Unsuccessful Interns, 1989-91

Test	1989-90 Successful Interns	1989-90 Unsuccessful Interns	1990-91 Successful Interns	1990-91 Unsuccessful Interns
English	19.4	18.3	19.4	18.1
Mathematics	16.3	13.6	16.4	15.1
Social Science	18.2	16.1	18.1	17.0
Natural Science	20.6	19.5	20.6	19.4
Composite	18.7	17.2	18.8	17.5

Mean NTE Scores for Successful and Unsuccessful Interns

The mean NTE scores for successful and unsuccessful interns were also calculated. As was the case with the ACT scores, the successful interns scored slightly higher on most NTE areas than did the unsuccessful interns; however the n for the unsuccessful interns is too small to determine whether this difference is significant. This trend needs to be monitored for several years. The data are presented in Table 34.

Table 34

NTE Scores for Successful and Unsuccessful Interns, 1989-91

Test	1989-90 Successful Interns	1989-90 Unsuccessful Interns	1990-91 Successful Interns	1990-91 Unsuccessful Interns
Communication Skills	662	662	663	659
General Knowledge	660	659	660	659
Professional Knowledge	661	660	661	660

Benefits of the KTIP Process

(1) Because the internship has generated enthusiasm among teachers, principals and superintendents, several Kentucky legislators are now interested in, and protectors of, the program. KTIP provides a unifying force across the state. School districts support it: resource teachers report that their involvement has improved their own classroom teaching, principals say the training has made them better evaluators of all their teachers, and former interns are now enthusiastically participating as resource teachers. Faculty involved in the program report improved relations with school personnel.

(2) Internship faculty and district personnel have expanded their internship interactions into a variety of collaborative efforts, including on-site research and evaluation studies.

(3) Each of the eight state universities and many of the 15 independent colleges have exerted leadership roles in one or more

aspects of the program. Internship faculty and staff communicate with each other regularly. Across the state there is now a common language and a common set of expectations regarding the internship, first-year teachers, classroom observations and the components of effective teaching.

(4) Preparation programs have changed. Assistance to and assessment of beginning teachers has taught college faculty a great deal about weaknesses in preservice programs as well as the powerful impact of the school environment on new teachers. All colleges now regularly involve school personnel in decisions relating to the content of preservice programs.

(5) Follow-up studies of first-year interns support the internship program as an induction into the profession that is beneficial to new teachers' future success.

(6) Special coding of individual(s) coding responses of the intern's performances provides data for training updates for particular individuals and/or groups.

(7) The internship year provides a final opportunity to screen new teachers prior to full licensure. Each beginning teacher internship committee has the responsibility of identifying persons who cannot handle the classroom situation (even with the committee's support over one or two years). These persons, fewer than two (2) percent of the total number of interns, are guided into career alternatives that keep them out of Kentucky classrooms.

Summary

The internship program has proven to be very effective as culmination of the individual's preparation for a career in teaching. The internship year provides opportunities for assessing strategies to improve assistance to new teachers. Continuous assessment of the intern coupled with periodic feedback provides committee members with an opportunity to induct a new colleague into the profession. Internship procedures also provide a legally and professionally defensible information base for making certification recommendations.

Like all dynamic programs, the internship program requires regular monitoring in order to improve. Monitoring sources include members of the Advisory Committee for the Teacher Internship Program, the Department of Education and feedback solicited from internship committee members. Additionally, interns are regularly surveyed and interviewed and the results compiled. Information from all sources becomes a basis for scheduling special activities to enhance the program's effectiveness. Information compiled on Kentucky's internship program closely echoes the findings reported in the recent MET Life Insurance Survey, in which nearly 60 percent of teachers favored extended clinical experience both before and after their first year of teaching. Nearly half the teachers surveyed believed that "a skilled experienced teacher" assigned to provide "advice and assistance" would have been helpful in preparing them for effective teaching.

Analysis of the performance data of first-year interns strongly supports the program's viability. It may well be viewed as the special link that focuses teacher educators throughout Kentucky.

Kentucky Teacher Internship Program
Classroom Observation Instrument

Intern's Name (Print) _____ Last _____ First _____ Middle

Intern's SS # _____ Date of Observation _____

School Name _____ School Number _____

District Name _____ District Number _____

Starting Time _____ Ending Time _____

1. Check the subject area observed.

_____ 1. Language Arts/English
_____ 2. Mathematics
_____ 3. Science
_____ 4. Social Studies
_____ 5. Music
_____ 6. Art
_____ 7. Physical Education
_____ 8. Industrial Education (5-12)
_____ 9. Home Economics Education (5-12)
_____ 10. Vocational Education _____
_____ 11. Special Education _____
_____ 12. Other _____

2. Check type of classroom in which observation occurred.

_____ 1. Self-contained Classroom
_____ 2. Field or Court
_____ 3. Library/Media Center
_____ 4. Laboratory/Shop
_____ 5. Resource Room
_____ 6. Other _____

Provide the following information for the class observed.

3. _____ Grade level(s) of students

4. _____ Total number of students in class

5. _____ Number of students having an IEP

6. _____ Intern's number of completed years teaching experience

KDE/MIC App
3018 1054 5/89

Length of coding (in minutes) _____

Observer's name (print) _____

Observer's signature _____

Intern's signature _____

LESSON COMPONENTS

		TEACHER BEHAVIORS												
Treatment		1. states/defines lesson component												
		2. explains component clearly												
		3. demonstrates component												
		4. provides guided practice												
		5. provides independent practice												

		TEACHER BEHAVIORS DURING INSTRUCTION												
Communication		1. cues students												
		2. uses emphasis												
		3. uses challenge/task attractions												
		4. uses sarcasm/negative affect												
Questioning Techniques		1. asks academic questions												
		2. asks multiple questions												
		3. allows call-outs												
		4. does not provide wait time												
		5. guides reciter												
		6. does not guide reciter												
		7. asks procedural questions												
		8. asks unrelated questions												
Responses		1. acknowledges student responses												
		2. rephrases/amplifies student responses												
		3. corrects/clarifies student responses												
		4. does not correct/clarify responses												
Praise		1. uses specific academic praise												
		2. uses general academic praise												
		3. uses group academic praise												
Management		1. uses specific conduct-related praise												
		2. stops misconduct positively												
		3. stops misconduct negatively												
		4. does not stop misconduct												
		5. manages overlapping events												
Time		1. minimizes management time												
		2. mismanages instructional time												

OBSERVATION NOTES:

Lesson Initiation:
1. _____ began observed lesson promptly.
2. _____ secured the attention of students before beginning instruction.
3. _____ used a review of students' previous work or previous lesson content to establish academic focus.
4. _____ provided an over view of lesson content or a statement of lesson objective(s) to establish academic focus.
5. _____ provide an overview of how the lesson would proceed to establish academic focus.

DURING SEATWORK

TEACHER BEHAVIORS TO BE CHECKED AT END OF LESSON
DURING THIS OBSERVATION, THE INTERN:

1. _____ asked questions, paused, then identified respondents.

2. _____ elicited responses from a variety of students in a nonrepetitive pattern to check for understanding or

   elicited responses from students in order to check for understanding (appropriate only in K-3 small group instruction in math and reading).

3. _____ used appropriate grammar and vocabulary.

4. _____ conducted a review or summary of major lesson components.

5. _____ provided clear directions for seatwork/homework. (Enter NA if not applicable.)

6. _____ circulated and monitored student's progress during seatwork. (Enter NA if not applicable.)

7. _____ was involved.

8. _____ was enthusiastic.

OBSERVER'S SUMMARY STATEMENT (OPTIONAL):

AFTER COMPLETING AN OBSERVATION, PLEASE CHECK TO INSURE THAT:

1. ALL INFORMATION ON THE FRONT PAGE OF THE INSTRUMENT IS COMPLETE.
2. EACH LESSON COMPONENT HAS A CHECK (✓) OR ZERO (0) ENTERED FOR EACH TREATMENT BEHAVIOR.
3. THE NUMBER OF TALLIES HAS BEEN ENTERED IN THE BOX TO THE LEFT OF EACH BEHAVIOR.
4. EACH LESSON INITIATION AND END OF LESSON BEHAVIOR HAS BEEN MARKED WITH A CHECK (✓), ZERO (0), OR NA.